arXiv:quant-ph/9808019v1 12 Aug 1998

PRA-HEP-98/6

Are quantum teleportation and cryptography predicted by quantum mechanics?

Miloš Lokajíček
Institute of Physics, AVČR, 18221 Prague 8, Czech Republic

Abstract

It has been shown that the predictions of some new phenomena (e.g., teleportation and cryptography) are based on some assumptions added to the quantum-mechanical model or modifying some of its basic axioms. The hitherto experiments presented as a support of the mentioned phenomena may be hardly regarded as sufficient, as they may be interpreted alternatively on the basis of simple interference processes.

Some new phenomena are supposed to exist in the nature (see, e.g., [1, 2, 3]). It is argued that they are predicted on the basis of the current quantum-mechanical mathematical model and of its orthodox interpretation. However, in the given arguments some additional assumptions have been joined to the QM model, some of them raising questions whether they are actually consistent with other axioms the QM model is based on. In the following we would like to call the attention to this fact.

According to the orthodox interpretation it is necessary to distinguish between the pure and mixed states: a pure state of a physical system should change into a mixed state during a measurement, or rather in any interaction with another object. A new special pure state of microscopic objects may arise, of course, in such an interaction. However, if two different objects do not mutually interact and do not form a pure state they represent a mixture being described with the help of a density matrix; such a state can be hardly represented by one vector in a Hilbert space (defined, e.g., as a direct tensor product of two simple Hilbert spaces representing individual objects) and interpreted as a pure state.

And any predictions of teleportation or cryptography processes start from the assumption that these basic characteristics of the quantum-mechanical

model need not be necessarily fulfilled, or that it is possible to pass freely from a mixed space to a pure space (or vice versa?). It has been assumed in all corresponding (teleportation) experiments that an entangled pair of photons has been prepared with the help of down conversion in a non-linear crystal since the two arising photons must be combined in a similar way as the photon pair in EPR experiments. However, the proper EPR photons are assumed to move then in a vacuum without any interaction (between the source and the detector) while the photons formed in the down conversion must go through the rest of a crystal, which can hardly occur without a series of secondary interactions inside the given macroscopic object; the properties of the photon being definitely settled in the surface plane of the crystal. Therefore, according to the standard quantum mechanics the considered photon pairs (after leaving the crystal) should necessarily represent mixed states.

Another assumption consists in the possibility of interpreting the system of two photons (e.g., the photons in Ref. [2] denoted as Nr. 1 and 2, i.e., a mixture of two fully independent photons) as a pure state in a Hilbert space spanned on four basic Bell's states although they should be described with the help of a corresponding (general) density matrix, like in the former case.

Therefore, both these assumptions should be regarded as going behind the standard quantum-mechanical model in which only pure states may be represented by single vectors in a Hilbert space; the model proposed and formulated by J. von Neumann [4] in 1932. The question arises then how to interpret the experiments being described in the papers quoted in the beginning of this paper. It is necessary to ask whether these experiments can really contribute to a justification of the mentioned modified assumptions, which has been argued quite explicitly, e.g., in Ref. [2].

We are afraid that such arguments are very premature as there is not any direct link between the given measurements and the mentioned predictions. The measured characteristics may be explained in a more natural way, e.g., as simple and natural correlation of processes being denoted generally as interference phenomena. Any new assumptions are not necessary; it is not necessary to relate these phenomena to entangled states of photon pairs, either.

The same arguments concern the very recent experiment performed by Tittel et al. [5]; see also Ref. [7]. Photons being formed by crystal down-conversion and going through very long optical fibers interact many times and the considered photon pairs represent again state mixtures and not pure

states; it is a kind of decoherence (see, e.g. [6]). In fact, we do not know practically anything what is going with photons passing through a crystal or optical fibers; it is known, however, that any observable change occurs practically always in the surface level of a given macroscopic object.

And thus, the fiber lengths must be considered fully irrelevant (with the exception of absorption) as the properties of any photon seem to be fixed in the instant when it leaves the last object before going into the analyzer. All the mentioned experiments indicate that a periodical characteristic relates closely to some internal properties of spinning photons, with the period corresponding to the given wave length. The instantaneous phase of this characteristic influences then decisively the effect of a photon in an analyzer. The periodical property of the photon may be then related to a kind of the quantum phase considered recently, e.g., in Ref. [8].

It is evident that all the mentioned experiments may be interpreted on the same basis as Newton fringes. It concerns also the so called entanglement swapping [9], where a mixed state is interpreted as a pure state without any actual substantiation (on the basis of an interference measurement only). There is not any experiment at the present time that would be able to distinguish between pure or mixed states under the given conditions. Also the values of coincidence counts obtained by combining different measuring channels may be interpreted as a direct consequence of the just mentioned characteristics.

The hitherto experiments may be, therefore, hardly regarded as an actual support for the existence of the announced teleportation and cryptography phenomena. There is, however, an additional reason why it is necessary to be very careful in doing similar predictions or conclusions. All such predictions are based on the existence of entangled states of EPR type, which follows from the Copenhagen interpretation. And there are some other experiments which should raise serious doubts, as they are questioning the validity of the quantum-mechanical model itself, especially its Copenhagen version.

These experiments have consisted in the measurement of photon (light) passage through three polarizers [10, 11]. The transmittance dependencies on relative angles between polarizer axes have contradicted convincingly the predictions based on Jones' matrices which represent a generalization of QM description in the case of real (imperfect) polarizers. Consequently, other models concerning the description of microscopic phenomena should be tried and tested; different types of hidden variables being included.

Such a conclusion might seem, of course, to be in an important contra-

diction to the fact that Bell inequalities have been violated in the standard EPR experiments (see, e.g., [12]). However, it has been shown by us quite recently that these inequalities do not cover all possible kinds of hidden variables. An additional (seemingly self-evident) condition has been included in all approaches of their derivations, which excludes, e.g., the influence of different impact points of photons into a microscopic grid of a macroscopic device (polarizer). Bell's inequalities cannot be derived if one admits that an exact impact point together with the photon spin influence results of measurement [13]. They may be derived only if at least one of these two factors is neglected.

In addition to the just mentioned facts another important question concerns the general decoherence problem, when an interaction with quantum vacuum is assumed to exist. If such a decoherence plays a role (as discussed in the last years) one must ask how long a pure state remains as a pure state. In such a case it is necessary to expect that the range of entangled state should be strongly limited. Additional doubts should, therefore, appear: whether all involved assumptions may represent a consistent basis for the given predictions.

Summarizing all these aspects and arguments we must conclude that mutually contradicting assumptions seem to be applied to in the contemporary discussions of new phenomena (involving the EPR problem) and that it is necessary to analyze newly not only these questions alone but also practically all fundamentals of the quantum-mechanical model, especially, if some additional assumptions going beyond this model are involved.

Numerous discussions with my colleagues and friends J. Krása and V. Kundrát about all related problems are highly appreciated.

References

[1] Ch. H. Bennett et al.: Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels; Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993), 1895-9.

[2] D. Bouwmeester et al.: Experimental quantum teleportation; Nature 390 (1997), 575-9.

[3] W. Tittel, G.Ribordy, N.Gisin: Quantum cryptography; Physics World, March 1998, 41-5.

[4] J. von Neumann: Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik; Springer - Berlin 1932.

[5] W. Tittel, J.Brendel, B.Gisin, T.Herzog, H.Zbinden, N.Gisin:: Experimental demonstration of quantum correlations over more than 10 km; Phys. Rev. A 57 (1998), 3229-32.

[6] A. Leggett: Time's arrow and the quantum measurement problem; in "Time's arrow today (ed. S.F.Savitt), Cambridge Univ. Press 1995, pp. 97-106.

[7] P. R. Tapster, J.G.Rarity, P.C.M.Owens: Violation of Bell's inequality over 4 km of optical fiber; Phys. Rev. Lett. 73 (1994), 1923-6.

[8] M.T. Fontenelle, M.Freyberger, H.Heni, W.P.Schleich, M.S.Zubairy: Quantum phase, photon counting and EPR variables; The Dilemma of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen - 60 Years Later (eds. A. Mann. M.Revzen), Inst. of Publish. Techno House, Bristol 1996, pp. 73-82.

[9] J.-W. Pan, D.Bouwmeester, H.Weinfurter, A.Zeilinger: Experimental entanglement swapping: Entangling photons that never interacted; Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998), 3891-4.

[10] J. Krása, J. Jiřička, M.Lokajíček: Depolarization of the light by imperfect polarizers; Phys. Rev. E 48 (1993), 3184-6.

[11] J. Krása, M.Lokajíček, J. Jiřička: Transmittance of a laser beam through a pair of crossed polarizers; Phys. Lett. A 186 (1994), 279-82.

[12] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger: Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A new violation of Bell's inequalities; Phys. Rev. Lett. 49 (1982), 91-4.

[13] M. Lokajíček: Locality problem, Bell's inequalities and EPR experiments; submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.; quant-ph/9808005 (1998).